



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,212	12/02/2003	Edward J. Koeneman	58482-010101	5429

7590 11/20/2009  
ATTN: CHRISTOPHER DARROW, ESQ.  
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP  
SUITE 400E  
2450 COLORADO AVENUE  
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404

EXAMINER
----------

FOREMAN, JONATHAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3736

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/727,212	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOENEMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JONATHAN ML FOREMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 3736	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 69,71-80,82 and 83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 69,71-80,82 and 83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 82 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,396,337 to McBean et al.

In regard to claims 69, 71, 72, 74 and 75, McBean et al. disclose a system for assisting neuromuscular function comprising: at least one EMG sensor (54a) for detecting self-actuation of a neuromuscular system; at least one joint position sensor (54b) for detecting self-actuation of a joint; at least one force sensor for measuring a parameter indicative of muscle resistance (Col. 6, lines 33 – 50; Col. 9, lines 8 – 10); a computer processor (Col. 7, lines 4 – 5) for implementing a protocol responsive when self-actuation or attempted self-actuation is detected by the at least one EMG sensor but is not detected by the at least one joint position sensor (Col. 7, lines 12 – 17; Col. 8, lines 1 – 21); and a motion causing device for assisting the at least one joint in movement, said motion causing device following the protocol implemented by the computer processor (Col. 8, lines 5 – 8). The system includes an electronic memory for storing information regarding the patient (Col. 10, lines 13 – 15). The protocol is based on previous measurements recorded from the EMG sensor, joint position sensor or the force sensor (Col. 10, lines 13 – 15). The motion causing device is an air muscle that includes at least one port (Col. 8, lines 43 – 45).

Art Unit: 3736

In regard to claims 82 and 83, McBean et al. disclose a system for assisting neuromuscular function comprising: at least one joint position sensor (24) for detecting self-actuation of a joint and measuring a joint motion (Col. 7, lines 33 – 48); a computer processor (34) for implementing a protocol responsive when self-actuation is detected by the at least one joint position sensor and the measured joint motion has not achieved a predetermined value or when self-actuation is attempted and the measured joint motion has not achieved a predetermined value (Col. 7, lines 12 – 17; Col. 8, lines 1 – 21; Col. 9, lines 8 – 10); and a motion causing device for assisting the at least one joint in movement, said motion causing device following the protocol implemented by the computer processor such that the joint motion achieves the predetermined value (Col. 8, lines 5 – 8).. The motion causing device is an air-muscle (Col. 8, lines 43 – 45).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,396,337 to McBean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,012,820 to Meyer.

In regard to claim 73, McBean et al. fail to disclose the system including at least one neuromuscular electrical stimulating system. Meyer discloses a system for neuromuscular function reeducation and restoring physical function of at least one neuromuscular system associated with an at least one joint in a patient, the system at least one neuromuscular electrical stimulating (NMES) system for providing neuromuscular stimulation to the at least one neuromuscular system (Col. 5,

Art Unit: 3736

lines 1 – 9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include at least one NMES as taught by Meyer to the system disclosed by McBean et al. in order to excite

5. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,396,337 to McBean et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,010,468 to Grove et al.

In regard to claim 76, McBean et al. disclose a motion causing device being an air-muscle, but fail to disclose a computer processor for controlling a valve to supply air to the air-muscle. Grove et al. disclose a system for restoring physical function of a neuromuscular system and teach a motion causing device being an air-muscle (133) that shortens in length upon inflation to cause the joint to pivot and includes at least one port for supplying air. Grove et al. teach a computer processor for controlling a valve for supplying air to the air-muscle (Col. 12, lines 47 – 60). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the motion causing device as disclosed by McBean et al. to include an air-muscle having a computer controlled valve as taught by Grove et al. in order to provide the system with an easily controllably motion causing device.

6. Claims 77 - 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,396,337 to McBean et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143277 to Wood et al.

In regard to claims 77 - 80, McBean et al. disclose obtaining measurements from an EMG sensor and a force sensor. However, McBean et al. fail to disclose displaying the measurements from the EMG sensor and the force sensor. Wood et al. disclose a system for restoring physical function of a neuromuscular system and teach displaying measurements from an EMG sensor and a force sensor [0055] for a patient to monitor the compliance and performance. It would have been

Art Unit: 3736

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system as disclosed by McBean et al. to include a display for displaying the measurements made by the EMG sensor and the force sensor as taught by Wood et al. in order to encourage patients to continue with their exercises [0010].

***Response to Amendment/Arguments***

7. The Declaration of James B. Koeneman filed on 7/27/09 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the McBean et al. reference. According to MPEP 715.04, the declaration must be made by all of the inventors of the subject matter claimed. The submitted declaration is only signed by one of the coinventors, James B. Koeneman. It has not been shown that less than all named inventors invented the subject matter of the claims under rejection. Therefore, the declaration does not meet the formal requirements of a 37 CFR 1.131 declaration. Additionally, the declaration fails to set forth in the body that all statements made on the information and belief are believed to be true (MPEP 715.04). Additionally, the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the McBean et al. reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). The declaration has failed to provide a nexus between the claimed invention and the evidence of conception. For example, the declaration fails to point out where at least one force sensor for measuring a parameter indicative of muscle resistance, where a valve, and where a first and second display have been conceived.

Art Unit: 3736

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN ML FOREMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4724. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571)272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3736

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. M. F./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3736

/Max Hindenburg/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736